



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

LT

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/280,637 03/29/99 ROBAR

T 4167-52

MMC2/0530

EXAMINER

MCCORMICK FAULDING & HUBER
185 ASYLUM STREET
CITY PLACE II
HARTFORD CT 06103-4102

SNOW, W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2862

11

DATE MAILED:

05/30/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/280637		
Examiner W. S. How	Group Art Unit 2862	

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/14/01
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) 21-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1-20, 32 a/33 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2862

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-20 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Varone in view of Sasahara et al.

Varone discloses all of the claimed subject matter, except for the insulator material, the rope having a rectangular cross-section and the Hall effect transducers. Sasahara teaches magnetically detecting flows in ferromagnetic members in non-magnetic insulator material. It would have been obvious to monitor ferromagnetic cord members in non-magnetic insulator material as claimed with the device of Varone in view of the teaching of Sasahara. The rope having a rectangular shape and the Hall effect transducers are considered obvious matters of design choice since they are old and known in the art.

3. Claims 5 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melamud et al.

Melamud discloses an apparatus to determine the strength of metal cables by applying and monitoring a magnetic field as claimed. It is considered an obvious design choice to determine the load bearing capacity of the cable once the strength is known. It is also considered

Art Unit: 2862

an obvious design choice to test ~~cord~~ members in insulator material as claimed since this is known in the art.

Snow/ds

05/16/01

walter snow
Walter Snow
Primary Examiner